



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,484	06/14/2001	Ari Riecki	602.346USW1	7900

32294 7590 03/29/2004

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

UBILES, MARIE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,484

Applicant(s)

RIEKKI, ARI

Examiner

Marie C. Ubiles

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on June 14 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 20, 23-30, 32-34 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 20, 23-30, 32-34 and 38 recite the limitations "A-party" and "B-party". Claim 20 recites the limitation "B-subscriber line" in line 9. Claim 24 recites the limitation "setting of it" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. It is not clear to the Examiner whether "A-party" is directly related to the first subscriber line or the second subscriber line; the same problem occurs with the limitation "B-party".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Redd, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,388).

As for claim 20, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses a system for allowing a telephone for allowing a telephone subscriber to selectively block incoming calls (i.e. call setup) for selected periods of time (i.e. method for controlling call setup in a telecommunication system) on an AIN telephone network (i.e. comprising a telephone network) (See *Fig. 2 and Best Mode, Col. 9, lines 1-14*), SSP type central offices (i.e. telephone exchange) connected to the AIN telephone network (i.e. a telephone exchange connected to the telephone network) (See *Fig. 2, SSPs 11, 13, 15, 17 and Best Mode, Col. 9, 27-42*), a subscriber on a telephone receiver A connected to the telephone exchange (or SSP 11) (i.e. a first subscriber line connected to the telephone exchange) (See *Fig. 2 and Best Mode, Col 9, lines 14-16*), a subscriber on a telephone receiver D connected to the telephone exchange (or SSP 17) (i.e. a second subscriber line connected to the telephone exchange) (See *Fig. 2*), a telephone station A (i.e. a first telecommunication terminal) (See *Fig. 2 and Best Mode, Col. 10, lines 20-22*), a telephone station D (i.e. a second telecommunication terminal) (See *Fig. 2 and Best Mode, Col. 10, lines 20-22*), the option to leave a message (or voice mail box) to the subscriber on telephone station D (i.e. an answering service pertaining to the B-party) (See *Best Mode, Col. 5, lines 59-62; Col. 10, lines 20-25 and 42-49*), a calling party on telephone station A calls a called party on telephone station D (i.e. in which method the first telecommunication terminal is used by the A-party and the second telecommunication terminal is used by the B-party) (See *Best Mode, Col. 10, lines 19-25*), a party at telephone station D activates selective call blocking (i.e. setting from the B-subscriber line a function preventing normal connection of a call to the B-party's telecommunication terminal) (See *Fig. 5 and Best*

Art Unit: 2642

Mode, Col. 15, lines 18-25); and a receive a string of DTMF digits from the calling party on telephone station A in order for the calling party to leave a message to a voice mail system of called party on telephone station D (i.e. directing by means of the A-party's telecommunication terminal a call received in the answering service to the B-party's telecommunication terminal)(See *Best Mode, Col. 15, lines 61-67*).

As for claim 21, Redd, Jr. et al. specifies the use on an Advanced Intelligent Network as part of the telephone network (i.e. an intelligent network is connected to the telephone network)(See *Figs. 2 & 4*), and a terminating attempt trigger (TAT) is generated at the system when the selective call blocking (i.e. call setup) feature is activated (i.e. call setup is controlled via the intelligent network) (See *Best Mode, Col. 10, lines 26-49*).

As for claim 22, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses the selection by the user of certain times of day for the automatic enablement of the selective call feature (i.e. normal call setup is prevented during a predetermined period of time)(See *Best Mode, Col. 13, lines 29-51*).

As for claim 23, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses the confirmation by verbal message to the subscriber of activation of the selective call blocking feature (i.e. wherein the B-party is informed about the function having been set)(See *Fig. 3B, step 328 and Best Mode, Col. 13, lines 7-11*).

As for claim 27, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses the use of a user ID and password by the subscriber in order to prevent unauthorized user from altering the status of the

selective call blocking feature (i.e. the B-party's right to switch on the service is verified)(See *Best Mode*, Col. 12, lines 27-33).

As for claim 29, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses the recognition of SSP 17 (or telephone exchange of the B-party) of the activation of the selective call block feature by telephone station D and generation of a Terminating Attempt Trigger (i.e. the function preventing normal call setup is set in the telephone exchange)(See *Best Mode*, Col. 10, lines 29-35).

As for claim 33, Redd, Jr. et al discloses the play of prerecorded announcement to a subscriber on telephone station A when the selective call blocking feature is activated by subscriber on telephone station D (i.e. the system comprises means for informing the A-party about the function switched on by the B-party) (See *Fig. 5*, steps 501-508).

3. Claims 30, 31, 32 and 37 are system claims that correspond directly to method claims 20, 22, 23 and 21 respectively, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

4. Claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 30.

5. As for claim 24, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses the activation and deactivation performed by the subscriber of the selective call blocking feature by selecting from one of a number of menu items over the telephone by using a DTMF input (i.e. wherein the setting of it are controlled via the B-party's telecommunication terminal using DTMF signaling)(See *Best Mode*, Col. 11, lines 52-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-12).

As for claim 25, Redd, Jr. et al discloses the play of prerecorded announcement to a subscriber on telephone station A when the selective call blocking feature is activated by subscriber on telephone station D (i.e. the A-party is informed about the function switched on by the B-party, using a voice menu) (See Fig. 5, steps 501-508).

As for claim 26, when the function is deactivated, giving the B-party information regarding parties having called during the service, using a text message would have been obvious. It would, for example, read on a subscriber checking telephone numbers of calling parties on a Caller ID TM device.

As for claim 28, Redd, Jr. et al. discloses the input of a DTMF signal by the subscriber on telephone station A in order to leave a message on the voice mail of subscriber on telephone station D (as read on "*connect via SSPs 11, 17*") (i.e. a call received by the answering service is controlled by means of the A-party's telecommunication terminal using DTMF signaling)(See Fig. 5, steps 502-503 and 508).

As for claim 35, Redd Jr. et al. discloses the receipt, transmittal and comparison of a string of DTMF digits at the SSP and ISCP (or telephone exchange)(i.e. the telephone exchange comprises means for processing tone frequency signals)(See *Best Mode*, Col. 10, lines 52-64).

While Redd Jr. et al. does not directly mention the use of a functional protocol and/or text message for function setting by the B-party's telecommunication terminal; the A-party being informed of function on B-party by use of a functional message and/or a text message; and the A-party controlling a call received by the answering service by means of a functional protocol and/or a keypad protocol; he does disclose the following:

"IP 47 may be connected to multiple switches within a telephone system via a T1 or ISDN Q.931 message interface ... IP 47 may be connected to at least one switch 17 and connected, via Ethernet TM interface to ISCP 40. In the preferred embodiment, IP 47 is connected via an ISDN, such as Bell Atlantic TM AIN, to ISCP 40. ... IP 47 may be used to perform all or part of the functions described in programming the selective call blocking service described above in connection with FIGS. 3A-3G." (See *Best Mode*, Col. 16, lines 37-45 and 48-50).

Thus, the A-party and the B-party will have the ability to control, deactivate and/or being informed of the function set up on terminal B by means of a functional message/functional protocol and/or a text message/keyboard protocol; as these are inherent features of ISDN Q.931.

6. Claim 34 is a system claim that corresponds directly to method claims 24 and 28, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

7. As for claim 36, the use of a normal telephone on a PSTN as a first subscriber and/or second subscriber terminal would have been obvious. It would, for example, read on the use of a regular phone connected to the Bell System (or Public Switched telephone Network) in the United States of America.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Strickland (US 6,101,251) teaches a method and apparatus for routing an anonymous call.

Irvin (US 6,418,211) teaches an adaptive call screening method.

Brennan et al. (US 5,329,578) teaches a system for providing mobility/management service wherein the subscriber can tailor the telephone service to provide communication mobility and incoming call management.

Shaffer et al. (US 6,600,817) teaches a method and apparatus for monitoring communication connections within and across time zones.

Swan et al. (US 6,263,071) teaches a telecommunications functions management system providing distinctive alerting based on caller selected option.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marie C. Ubiles whose telephone number is (703) 305-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/881,484

Page 9

Art Unit: 2642

Marie C. Ubiles
March 18, 2004.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ahmad Matar". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ahmad" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Matar".

AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600